

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/689,001 10/12/2000		Jeffery D. Arnett	30488-1016	7673		
30542	7590	10/21/2005		EXAMINER		
FOLEY & P.O. BOX 8		R	CASTELLANC	CASTELLANO, STEPHEN J		
SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	.,			3727		

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			001	ARNETT ET AL.					
			er	Art Unit					
			J. Castellano	3727					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicat or Reply	tion appears on th	e cover sheet with t	the correspondence ac	ddress				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL asions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF T 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no e action. ry period will apply and v by statute, cause the ap	HIS COMMUNICAT vent, however, may a reply will expire SIX (6) MONTHS plication to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this of DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 01 August 200	5						
· · · · · ·	•	This action is							
/—	•	prosecution as to the	e merits is						
٠,١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	on of Claims	•	•						
· · ·		ending in the app	lication						
•	Claim(s) <u>6-10,12,26,29 and 30</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>10</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
•	Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>6-9, 12, 26, 29 and 30</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) <u>6-9, 72, 26, 29 and 30</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
'=	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election	requirement						
·			oquii omomi.						
	on Papers								
• —	The specification is objected to by the E		_						
10)∐	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection	-	-						
. —	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	•		=	* *				
11)[_	The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. N	ote the attached Of	ffice Action or form P	ГО-152.				
Priority ι	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc	cuments have be	en received.						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of t application from the International	• •		eived in this National	Stage				
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for	•	` ''	eived.					
2) Notic 3) Infon	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC r No(s)/Mail Date			mary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application (PTo	O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/689,001

Art Unit: 3727

Claims 1-5, 11, 13-25, 27 and 28 have been canceled. Claims 6-10, 12, 26, 29 and 30 are pending.

Applicant's election of the specie of Group I (Fig. 6-9) and claims 6-9, 12, 26, 29 and 30 in the reply filed on January 18, 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim 10 stands withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected specie, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on January 18, 2005.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6-9, 12, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seitz et al. (Seitz).

Seitz discloses a latch system for a container, the container including a first section and a second section, the latch comprises a latch pin (rod 21) mounted on the first section (cover 12), a deflectable member (one or both of the bushings 23) and a latch (L member 14) pivotally coupled to the latch pin so that the deflectable member is positioned between the latch pin and the latch, the latch removably engages the second section (receptacle 11), the deflectable member is configured to absorb relative compression movement or movement of the lid downwardly which will move the latch pin downwardly with respect to the receptacle 11 which

Art Unit: 3727

remains relatively stationary such as when the horizontal leg 15 of the latch is depressed or pushed downwardly on in order to release the engagement of complementary projections 26 and 28.

Re claim 29, deflectable member (bushing 23) is comprised of plastic as stated in line 41 of column 3.

Claims 6-9, 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Henne, Munoz and Kushman et al. (Kushman).

Henne and Munoz are similar oven door latches. Henne discloses a latch system for a container, the container including a first section and a second section, the latch comprises a latch pin (30) mounted on the first section (body of the oven), a deflectable member (bushing 66) and a latch (20) pivotally coupled to the latch pin so that the deflectable member is positioned between the latch pin and the latch, the latch removably engages the second section (oven door 34), the deflectable member is configured to absorb relative compression movement or movement of the lid toward the oven body which will move the latch (20) with respect to the oven body and the pin 30 which are relatively stationary. Munoz structure is similar and would similarly read on the claims.

Kushman discloses a latch system for a container, the container including a first section and a second section, the latch comprises a latch pin (axle 39) mounted on the first section (storage bin or vessel body), a deflectable member (bushing 41) and a latch (34) pivotally coupled to the latch pin so that the deflectable member is positioned between the latch pin and the latch, the latch removably engages the second section (roof 25), the deflectable member is configured to absorb relative compression movement or movement of the roof downwardly

Art Unit: 3727

which will move the latch downwardly with respect to the vessel body and the latch pin (axle 39).

Prior Art admission:

Applicant admits that plastic, rubber and metal as well known materials for bushings.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seitz, Henne, Munoz and Kushman.

Seitz discloses the plastic bushing material. Seitz discloses the invention except for the rubber and metal material. Henne, Munoz and Kushman do not teach a material for the bushing. Applicant admits that plastic, rubber and metal as well known materials for bushings. Also, there is a lack of criticality to the material specified as evidenced by applicant's disclosure of plastic, rubber and metal as acceptable materials. It would have been obvious to provide either plastic, rubber or metal as the material of the bushing in order to provide a material with the specific quality or qualities desired, plastic and rubber are known for easy moldability, selflubricating, anti-friction, noise-reduction, maintenance reduction and strength in absorbing compression and metal is known for high yield strength, durability and strength in absorbing compression.

Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant mentions that the latch system of Seitz is made of rigid material. While

Application/Control Number: 09/689,001

Art Unit: 3727

this is true, there is no indication that the bushing specifically is rigid material. A plastic material is disclosed for the bushing of Seitz. Nothing precludes the bushing from being a deflectable member, that is, a member capable of deflection or movement. Nothing precludes the bushing from absorbing relative compression movement. The compressive forces are inherently present by the users manipulation of the latch. These forces compresses the bushing. Eventhough, the compression of the bushing may be minimal or minor when compared to a more elastic or resilient bushing material. The slidable engagement mentioned in the rebuttal of Munoz doesn't preclude compression movement and the rotational surface of Kushman doesn't preclude compression movement.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Castellano whose telephone number is 571-272-4535. The examiner can normally be reached on Tu-F 6:30-5.

Art Unit: 3727

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen J. Castellano Primary Examiner Art Unit 3727